



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,817	11/17/2003	Igor Troitski		2566

35662 7590 10/06/2004

IGOR TROITSKI
853 ARROWHEAD TRAIL
HENDERSON, NV 89015

EXAMINER

EVANS, GEOFFREY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,817

Applicant(s)

TROITSKI, IGOR

Examiner

Geoffrey S Evans

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,6-8 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20031117(2 pages).
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the word "comprise" on lines 3 and 6 is legal phraseology. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
2. The subject matter of this application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Applicant is required to furnish a drawing under 37 CFR 1.81. The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, all of the features of the system recited in claims 10-12 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing(s).
3. Claims 2,6-8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how claim 2 is intended to further limit claim 1 since claim 1 already recites creation of laser based damages.

Respectfully suggest the following claim language (if appropriate) " 2. The method of claim 1, wherein the transparent material does not have special light-sensitive characteristics.". Regarding claim 6, it is also unclear how it further limits claim 1 and the metes and bounds of the claim since the visual effects are not specified and only a "chance" is present. Respectfully suggest canceling claim 6. Claims 7 and 8 are indefinite solely because they depend upon claim 6. In claim 10 it is unclear what relationship if any the "computer system" recited on line 2 has with the "computer system" recited on line 4. If they are different computer systems than they should be identified as "a first computer system" and as "a second computer system" respectively.

In claim 11 it is unclear how the "laser" relates to the "laser system" for generating radiation. Is it a second laser? In claim 12 it is unclear how the "laser system" relates to the "laser system" recited in claim 10. The following language is respectfully suggested for claim 12: "12. The system of claim 11 wherein the laser system generates a harmonic of the fundamental wavelength produced by the laser to create laser-induced damages inside the transparent material."

4. The following grammatical changes to the claims are suggested: In claim 1 on line 3 changing "the interference pattern, corresponding to given object" to "an interference pattern, corresponding to a given object", on lines 5 and 6 changing "high quality holographic image" to "a high quality holographic image". In claim 3 changing on line 1 "including" to "further comprising", on lines 2 and 3 changing "holographic image of given object" to "the holographic image of the object". In claim 4 changing on line 1 "including" to "further comprising" and "of interference" to "of the interference" and on line 3 changing "these regions so that this" to "said regions so that said". In claim 5 changing on line 1 "including" to "further comprising" and on line 3 changing "n independent trials" with "independent trials". In claim 7 on line 1 changing "including" to "further comprising" and "of interference pattern at" to "of an interference pattern on at". In claim 8 on line 1 changing "including" to "further comprising" and on lines 2 and 3 changing "the diffraction grating (or iridescent hologram)." to "a diffraction grating or an iridescent hologram.". In claim 9 on line 7 change "corresponding" to "corresponding to". In claim 10 on line 8 "laser system" should be "a laser system".

5. Claims 1,3-5, and 9 are allowed.

6. Claims 2,6-8,10-12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

7. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

Applicant is advised of the availability of the publication "Attorneys and Agents Registered to Practice Before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office." This publication is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Monaghan et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,388,780, Monaghan et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,567,193, Yokozawa in U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0118915 A1 disclose producing holograms by using a laser beam to shape the surface of a workpiece. Koyama et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,291,797 discloses forming an optical element for a hologram. Yang discloses in U.S. Patent No. 6,166,835 a holographic memory.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey S Evans whose telephone number is (571)-

Art Unit: 1725

272-1174. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30AM to 4:00 PM,
alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571)-272-1171. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-872-9306.

GSE


Geoffrey S. Evans

Primary Examiner

Group 1700